

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 22-md-3047-YGR

MDL No. 3047

**CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER NO. 28
(Trial Logistics, Motion to Intervene,
et al.)**

This Document Relates to:
All Actions

Upcoming Case Management Conferences:
November 19, 2025 at 2:00 p.m.
December 15, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. over Zoom
January 26, 2026 at 8:00 a.m.

TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

The Court held a further case management conference in the above-captioned matter on October 24, 2025. This order memorializes and expands upon the deadlines set and findings made by the Court during that conference.

I. TRIAL LOGISTICS

First, the Court considered the parties' written and oral arguments regarding the location of the first bellwether trial and GRANTS Breathitt's request to try the case in Oakland, California rather than in McKinleyville, California. Upon further reflection, the facilities in Oakland will better accommodate all parties and will be more cost effective for plaintiff Breathitt and the court. That said, the Court still considers a trial in McKinleyville a possible option that may provide some additional information to the parties, notwithstanding the inconvenience and cost.

The Court understands that the school districts are advocating for back-to-back trials in the summer of 2026 and that the Attorneys General would like to have their trial be slotted second in

1 the litany. The Court further understands that defendants would like to have more time in between
2 the school districts' trials and that they believe the Attorneys General case will not be ready for
3 trial. The Court has reserved the summer of 2026 for these trials and will attempt to use the time
4 effectively for this MDL.

5 In terms of preparing the Attorneys General case for trial, the Court requested that the
6 Attorneys General attempt to synthesize the laws of the 18 states bringing consumer protection
7 and other related state law claims. Undoubtably, the single COPPA claim brought by all 29
8 Attorneys General can be tried collectively. As part of this process, a chart may be useful to
9 identify the overlapping elements and determine whether certain claims should be bifurcated. The
10 parties may use AI tools as a starting point if they so choose. The Court will continue to discuss
11 the issue at the next case management conference.

12 **II. TIME'S MOTION TO INTERVENE (DKT. NO. 2262)**

13 For the reasons stated on the record, the motion is denied. The motion fundamentally
14 misunderstands the logistics of the process and the Court's analysis of motions to seal. As a
15 consequence, the request unduly burdens the process for marginal benefit. This Court is already
16 vigilant about public access and does not need an additional layer of complication to assess the
17 issues of whether information should be sealed.

18 That said, and as discussed on the record, to ensure prompt public access, the Court adjusts
19 the protocol to require that the parties unseal information *immediately* once the parties agree that a
20 document, or information redacted from a document, should not be sealed.

21 **III. COLOR DOCUMENTS**

22 Parties are requested to provide the Court with courtesy copies of documents filed in color
23 if over 25 pages in length. The Court finds the color helpful but is trying to avoid the additional
24 resources in terms of the cost and time to print such documents.

25 **IV. ADMINISTRATIVE**

26 If the Court does not resolve Meta's motions for relief from two non-dispositive pretrial
27 orders related to Frances Haugen, Vaishnavi Jayakumar, and Arturo Bejar before the next case
28 management conference, the parties may argue the motion. (Dkt. Nos. 2006 and 2239.)

1 The Court **GRANTS** plaintiffs' fifteenth consolidated submission to appoint guardians *ad*
2 *litem* and the accompanying motion to seal. (Dkt. Nos. 2301 and 2302.)

3 This terminates Dkt. Nos. 2262, 2301, and 2302.

4
5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6
7 Dated: October 27, 2025

8 
9 YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California